

successful at that. His dedication to excellence led Pete to academic success at Baltimore's Douglass High School and carried him onward until he earned his bachelor's degree at Morgan State University, his master's degree in mathematics at the University of Wisconsin, and the experience that would make him a master teacher in more ways than one. Yet, Pete Rawlings never forgot from whence he had come. He was called to public service and rose to chair one of the most powerful committees in the Maryland legislature.

The source of much of Pete's influence can be traced to his chairmanship of the appropriations committee in Maryland's House of Delegates, the legislative body where I served together with him for nearly 14 years. Pete was determined to make his lifelong fight for better schools, health care and housing the center of legislative debate, and he did succeed. He was a driving force behind the debates about reorganizing Maryland's school system, Maryland's higher education system, expanding financial support for our public schools, extending health care and creating safe and affordable housing for tens of thousands of additional families. We who were privileged to know and work with Pete understood that his influence did not derive from his position of power alone.

As Dr. Steven Carter once observed, true leaders are defined by their integrity. Leaders of integrity have the capacity to discern right from wrong and they act upon what they know to be right even if that commitment places them in peril. Dr. Carter's insights about integrity are exemplified by Pete Rawlings' lifetime of service to the people of our community and State. In his commitment to the education of our children, health care for all and fair housing, Delegate Rawlings consistently followed his vision of what is right, both for the present and for decades to come. At times, he was rewarded for his dedication by harsh criticism. Yet Pete remained steadfast, knowing that the course that he followed was opening the doors of opportunity for many people to come. Otherwise, he knew they would be left on the outside looking in and left in a state of arrested development. He did not seek celebrity or acclaim, but generations to come will remember him as a true and faithful servant who kept the faith of the people he served.

Mr. Speaker, all too often those of us in public life worry too much about the next election. A true statesman, however, worries about the next generation and children yet unborn. Pete Rawlings was such a man.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, I am moved to share with you that dying from cancer, my friend and colleague continued working from his hospital bed until his death. The people of Maryland have lost a great leader and I have lost a great friend and mentor. At this difficult moment for Pete's loving wife Nina and their wonderful family, I join

all the people of the great State of Maryland in offering our prayers and our gratitude for a life well lived. I thank God that he allowed Pete Rawlings' life to eclipse with my own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RENEWABLE FUELS STANDARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed an energy bill, the first comprehensive energy bill that we have had in more than a decade. It is now being considered by the other body. I would like to talk about just one small part of the energy bill and that is the ethanol industry. Sometimes this is controversial. Many times people feel that this is simply a giveaway to the Midwest and particularly to farmers, but I would like to take another look at this.

It is true that the ethanol tax credit is 52 cents a gallon. In 2003, we produced 2.7 billion gallons of ethanol, so that amounts to a \$1.4 billion tax incentive. Of course, that is a cost to the taxpayer. But that is not the end of the story. The ethanol industry increases the demand for corn by roughly 10 to 15 percent and as most people understand, when the demand goes up, it also drives the price up. What happens is that we, because of the ethanol industry, increase the price of corn by a minimum of five to 10 cents per bushel, and in 2002 it is estimated that the price of corn increased by roughly 40 to 50 cents per bushel. As prices rise, farm price supports decrease. For instance, if a bushel of corn brings \$1.50 a bushel, the price support at \$1.50 is 82 cents in the farm bill. If the price goes to \$2.70, there is zero price support. As a result, what we have found is that the increase in price driven by ethanol decreases the cost of the farm bill by roughly \$1 billion. As a matter of fact, higher commodity prices in 2002 reduced farm bill spending by roughly \$3 billion along with the drought. In 2003, the farm bill is going to be reduced by roughly \$6 billion from projected cost. That is a 25 to 30 percent less costly farm bill than what we had anticipated.

In addition, and this is something that is really important, ethanol is

projected to lower gas prices by 6.6 cents per gallon based on 2002 prices. What that does, it translates into a \$3.3 billion annual savings to consumers. On the one side, we have a \$1.4 billion tax incentive which costs the taxpayers, but on the other side we have a \$1 billion tax saving in the farm bill and we also have a \$3.3 billion saving at the pump. So the net saving of the ethanol part of the farm bill and a part of the energy bill is roughly \$3 billion.

In addition, ethanol reduces dependence on foreign oil, equal to about what we received from Iraq before the war; reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 12 to 19 percent; reduces carbon dioxide by 35 percent; provides 192,000 new jobs in the United States; improves the U.S. trade balance by \$2 billion; increases net farm income by \$4.5 billion annually; and it can be produced from corn stalks, rice straw, waste products and switchgrass, so it is not confined to the Midwest States. As a matter of fact, we have some ethanol plants being developed now in California. It also increases the octane in fuel because of higher combustion rates.

Then I would like to mention also the fact that it can be used in diesel fuel to increase energy efficiency. It can be used to produce fuel cells. And also it produces high protein livestock feed as a by-product.

The last thing I would like to mention is something that is very much misunderstood. We often hear people say, it takes more energy to produce ethanol than it yields. Actually for every BTU of fossil fuel used to produce ethanol, that is, to plant the corn, to till it, cultivate it, harvest it and process it, for every 1 BTU, British Thermal Unit, you get \$1.389 BTUs of energy. In contrast, for gasoline for every BTU you get .808 BTUs, and for MTBE you get .675 BTUs of energy. You have a much higher yield.

You say, where does this come from? Basically, it comes from the fact that the corn absorbs the sun and this extra energy comes from the sun. It is very energy efficient, and we think it is going to be a tremendous benefit to the U.S. economy as we move forward and as we go from 2.7 billion gallons of ethanol to roughly 5 billion within the next few years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the war in Iraq. First of

all, we all must recognize that over 400 Americans have been killed in Iraq and those numbers are rising. One, two, and now 16 and 17 lives at a time. We do not even know how many Iraqis have died because the Pentagon classifies that information as irrelevant. When we asked Ambassador Bremer at an International Relations Committee hearing how many Iraqis had been killed, he said he did not know because that was not really relevant to reconstruction efforts.

What we are witnessing are the results of a failed and failing foreign policy as a result of the fact that the Bush administration launched a preemptive war that was neither justified nor necessary.

□ 2130

To persuade many Members of Congress and the public to support this war, the administration apparently manipulated intelligence information and spun a distorted web of deception, and this will not be forgotten. Congress should not be talking about adjournment until we have answered these incredibly important questions about how we got into this mess.

That is why I have introduced House Resolution 410, which states that Congress should not adjourn until we have started an investigation into these questions as called for by the Waxman and the Tauscher resolutions. These questions are absolutely relevant. The American people deserve the answers. The methods by which we got into this war, the poor intelligence, and the unwillingness to work with the United Nations have shaped the current quagmire that we face; and, again, this is not going away.

Furthermore, in its rush to war, the administration completely failed to properly plan for its aftermath. This shortsightedness has cost American, as well as Iraqi, lives and created chaos and insecurity in Iraq. Unilateralism, we have found out, and some of us have known for many years, is not leadership; and unilateralism will not succeed in Iraq, as we are seeing. What we need is an effective transition strategy, effective transition strategy, so that we do not leave a worse disaster in its wake. That strategy must include a clear vision of how and when United States troops will come home and a real plan, a real plan, for Iraqi political and economic success. To achieve such success, we need to abandon what the New York Times has recently called "the miserable United States monopoly in Baghdad."

Although United States unilateralism has gravely damaged our relations with much of the world, we must continue to at least try to internationalize the transition to Iraqi independence. The United Nations should have real political and economic authority in this effort at peacekeeping and rebuilding. The Pentagon is really not the right agency to foster the creation of this new government; the

United Nations is. And, yes, some of us have suggested to the President that Donald Rumsfeld be asked to leave because we believe that he has led this effort in the wrong direction and has not planned adequately for the protection of our young people. So once again we hope that this resolution will come up before we leave.

As a candidate, George Bush, remember, dismissed the concept of nation-building; but as Commander in Chief, he has really mangled it. So we should really let the United Nations fulfill its mission by leading the effort to forge peace, security, and democracy in Iraq.

What should the United States role in Iraq be during this transition? For starters, we should at least recognize that we need to win friends and allies and not make new enemies. Also, I have said before and I will say it again, I believe that our Nation should absolutely pay for the damage that it has caused through its bombing, through its killing; but repairing bombing damage does not mean handing billions of dollars to Bechtel and Halliburton with regard to the no-bid contracts which they are receiving. Iraq's long-term economic development really should be in its own hands just as its sovereignty should be.

Again, as I have said earlier, we are really in a quagmire right now, one of poor planning and poor policy. And it is costing hundreds of American lives and hundreds of billions of dollars. Where in the world will we find the resources for our senior citizens and our children? How are we going to fund Leave No Child Behind, the \$9 billion that we need to put into public education? How are we going to fund affordable housing? Where will we find the resources to ensure our public transportation system and all of those quality-of-life issues that Americans so deserve? Not to mention our veterans. Where do we find the resources to provide their benefits which they so deserve?

So we must find a way out of this. And of course that means, again, for starters that the Iraqi people and their representatives must have a greater role and a real role in shaping their own state, and that means that the United States must shift authority to the U.N., and that means we must adopt new tactics that will enhance U.S. security and Iraqi safety by encouraging peace and hope rather than war and fear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHUSTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SOLIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are beginning to see comparisons being made between the U.S. situation in Iraq and the situation we were in in Vietnam. Some are valid; some are not.

One comparison is completely valid and could apply to any conflict. Soldiers get hurt and maimed and die. As a young doctor, I served as a medical officer in the Navy from 1968 to 1970. I worked in California with troops evacuated from Vietnam, and I see those faces when I go up to Walter Reed today.

The issues that we discuss on the floor, who was pushy with the CIA, who knew more than he said, who knew less than he claimed, are important; but they are not important because we want to play some kind of political game of "gotcha." They are important because they are key links in the chain of events that led to more than 130,000 Americans being deployed in Iraq, that led to more than 400 dying, and led to wards filled with boys on Georgia Avenue who do not have arms and legs anymore.

More Americans have died in Iraq in the past 8 months than died in the first 3 years in Vietnam. Regardless of whether this war makes or breaks the Bush Presidency, they are dead.

I did not support the President's decision to go to war. I believe that whatever threat the Hussein regime posed was being effectively contained. I believed and still believe that the presence of large numbers of U.N. inspectors roaming around Iraq was doing a